

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

IN Special SESSION

Monday, January 20, 1975

CITY OF FORT WAYNE, INDIANA
JOURNAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE COMMON COUNCIL

The Common Council of the City of Fort Wayne met in the Council Chambers Monday evening January 20 A.D., 1975, in Special Session. President James Stier in the chair, and Charles W. Westerman Clerk, at the desk, present the following members ✓ viz:
Burns ✓, Hinga ✓, Kraus ✓
Moses ✓, Nuckles A, Donald Schmidt A
Vivian Schmidt ✓, Stier ✓, Talarico ✓
Absent ✓
Councilmen Nuckles, Donald Schmidt,

a silent prayer was said by Councilman Moses
The invocation was given by Councilman
regarding flag that was posted in
memoriam

Received report from the City Controller for the month of _____, 19 _____. Motion made and carried that report be made a matter of record and placed on file.

special _____, 19 _____,
The minutes of the last regular _____, 19 _____,

Session having been delivered to the Council, were, on motion, approved and published.

Brown
Schmidt
Lemire
Moore
Hinaga

A) Hearings

1) Public hearings
on the Bill

B) Committee Room
Discussion

2) Change
3) Return to the
Committee

C) Council - Special Session

- a) Prayer from Chairman
- b) Passage - ~~Chairman~~ Chairman
- c) Adjourn.

6/
74-12-34

all in favor say!
Opposed
Roll call -

acceptance
all in favor say!
Opposed
Carried

Passage
all in favor
say!
Opposed
Roll call
Roll carried
Passed

36
Bd
#341 over 1000

FORT WAYNE CHAPTER

Izaak Walton League of America, Inc.

DEFENDER OF SOIL, WOODS, WATERS AND WILD LIFE
17100 GRIFFIN RD., HUNTERTOWN, INDIANA 46748

PRESIDENT: FRANK A. WEBSTER
422 UTILITY BUILDING
FORT WAYNE, INDIANA 46802

Clean Water Committee



CITY OFFICE:
616 HIGH STREET
FORT WAYNE, INDIANA 46808

January 20, 1975

To: Common Council, City of Fort Wayne
Subject: Fort Wayne Sewage Works - Hearing on Proposed Rates

Gentlemen:

It has long been our belief that the cost of waste treatment services must be ultimately borne by the users. Therefore, we do not oppose a sewer rate increase BUT we do believe that there are some missing parts to the rate increase story. We feel obligated to learn the precise degree to which the rate increase is scheduled to improve environmental quality of this community and how it is designed to live up to the 1972 Clean Water Act amendments.

This hearing was advertised December 30, 1974 and not until today were the plans, specifications, cost estimates and Ordinance copies available for inspection - at least I believe they were finally filed in the City Clerk's office. It might have been possible to gather the information we wanted from these materials had they been available but as it is we will have to ask now and we would like answers here tonight.

Under the 1972 Clean Water Act amendments, the law prescribes:

Each user of a municipal treatment facility must pay his full share of the costs. To obtain a grant after March 1, 1973, a municipality will have to adopt a system of user charges insuring that all recipients of wastewater treatment services pay their proportionate share of the costs of operation and maintenance.

In addition, each industrial use of the municipal plant must repay a proportion of the Federal grant corresponding to its percentage use of the plant's total capacity. This industrial cost recovery system is intended to encourage industries to choose the most cost-effective solution to their waste treatment problems whether it be independent treatment or the use of public facilities.

The municipality may retain 50 percent of the portion of the Federal share recovered from the industrial users. The amount kept by the city will provide a fund for future expansion and reconstruction of the facility. These provisions are designed to make the municipalities' waste treatment facilities financially self-sustaining.

We would like to know by what system household user charges were calculated?

By what system were commercial and industrial user charges calculated? Does the industrial rate reflect the required cost recovery system payback?



Jan. 20, 1975
Sewage Rate Hearing page 2

How has the Board of Works provided for the 50% portion of these monies which may be held for the facility's future expansion and reconstruction? It is our understanding that these monies must be in an identifiable fund for these purposes and may not revert to the general fund.

Does the rate increase reflect any increase in industrial surcharge? (a surcharge is currently affixed to large loads of suspended solids and/or BOD sent through the plant by single users) Will those industries on surcharge be subject to added rates for a cost recovery system?

What is the anticipated surcharge income per year?

What is the anticipated cost recovery income per year?

How many industries send wastes for municipal treatment? (Lists we have seen vary in numbers and no hospitals, dry cleaners and only one laundry are included)

Under the law the householder is no longer obligated to pick up the total treatment load for industry or commercial users.

Further, the municipality is obligated to require pre-treatment by any industry sending wastes to the plant if that waste would overload, clog filters or seriously upset the delicate biological processes of the plant OR wastes that would pass through untreated.

We believe failure by the municipality to properly inventory and assess rates to commercial and industrial users not only inflicts an unacceptable burden on the household rate payer BUT invites environmental disaster by a treatment plant gone septic or toxic wastes (such as heavy metals) passing through the treatment works. Do all industries and commercial establishments file waste questionnaires so that rates and surcharges are accurately and equitably applied?

We would also like to have a breakdown of the ways in which the sewage utility produces revenues and how these hopefully reduce rates? (or go into an "improvement" fund for future plant expansion?) For example, the plant makes methane gas from an activated sewage sludge system and this powers pumps and engines. How much does this offset treatment costs? Does the "new gas compressor and new storage tank" to be financed indicate more methane production that can be used as power source or sold? Another example would be plans to derive income from sludge use as fertilizer and as an organic land treatment. These should be definable factors working toward lower user fees.

Respectfully submitted,
Clean Water Committee, Fort Wayne
Chapter Izaak Walton League

Jane H. Dustin
Mrs. T. E. Dustin, Co-Chair
1802 Chapman Road
Huntertown, Indiana 46748

Clean Water Committee
Fort Wayne Chapter Izaak Walton League
Huntertown, Ind.
Jan. 20, 1975

To: Fort Wayne City Council
Fort Wayne, Indiana

Subject: Sewer Rate Increase Hearing

I am Ethyle R. Bloch, co-chairman of the Clean Water Committee,
Fort Wayne Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America.

On December 30, 1974 the Fort Wayne newspapers carried a legal notice telling of the "Notice of Determination to Construct and Finance Improvements to Fort Wayne Sewage Works and of Hearing on Proposed Rates". On Jan. 15, 1975 another legal notice appeared "(Official Notice) City of Fort Wayne, Indiana Bond Sale Notice". This was for bids for the purchase of revenue bonds to finance the city's share of the cost of the sewage plant expansion. At the end of both of these Notices was a paragraph stating that copies of plans, specifications, cost estimates and the two Council Ordinances already passed on Dec. 27, 1974 by the City Council would be available for inspection by any interested parties during regular business hours in the office of the City Clerk and also in the office of the City Controller. On Friday, Jan. 17, 1975 I was unable to find this material in the City Controller's office, and the only information the City Clerk had was the Council's official copy of the signed ordinances. Not until tonight has all this information been available. This is an inexcusable happening and citizens will not condone it again.

The Clean Water Committee realizes that sewer rate increases may be needed for an expansion of the sewage treatment plant. How much increase is needed and the equality of the rates charges should be the determining factors.

My questions to you are:

1. How much money do you anticipate will be raised by this increase? Will this pay off these new bonds by 1997 when there are still outstanding monies to be paid off from bonds issued in 1959, 1961 and 1970?

2. Do your anticipated figures include the New Haven area and also the areas now currently served by private utilities that, I am told, will ultimately be tied into the city's plant? Will the expanded facility be able to adequately treat all this additional sewage?

Fort Wayne currently treats part of Diversified Utilities area in the Abobe township area. I assume this is on a 100% surcharge rate. When the city treats the total Diversified Utilities area, as it does on an erratic schedule when their plant breaks down, how much is Diversified charged? Is this a 100% surcharge rate?

3. Will New Haven, which is out of the corporate limits of the city, pay the 100% surcharge rate?

4. What is a bulk rate contract? What is the revenue from the bulk rate contracts?

5. Will the industrial surcharge remain the same as in the 1971 change and addition to the Municipal code, or will it increase or decrease? What are the approximate revenues from industrial surcharges now? Does this revenue cover the cost of the extra treatment?

Nothing is mentioned about industrial surcharge for this new rate increase. According to Chapter 26, 1971 Municipal Code, certain charges were to be made in excess of definite amounts of Biochemical Oxygen Demand, Chemical Oxygen Demand and suspended solids. All other toxic substances, heavy metals, radioactive materials were prohibited, ^{and} ~~and~~ some limits the industries or commercial businesses were to treat their own deleterious materials. We request this basic charge be changed to reflect the limitations that the City is now under in the provisions of their newly acquired NPDES Discharge Permit, granted the first of this year from the State and EPA. We believe the rates per pound of excess BOD, COD and/or suspended solids could be increased but the concentrations should be lowered to meet the city's limitations. Instead of the concentration of 300 mg/l of BOD, the limit should be 15 - 22.5 mg/l concentration of BOD and/or COD. Instead of 350 mg/l of suspended solids content this figure should be 15 - 22.5 mg/l. In addition phosphorus should also be made a charged item since the city has to give special, expensive treatment for phosphate removal and has a limit of 1.0 mg/l in their Permit. If a new charge is not made for industrial wastes into the treatment facility, then you are guilty of making the other users bear this load unfairly, because someone has to pay for this expensive treatment.

The Clean Water Committee maintains that the rate for 100 cubic feet should be the same for all quantities of water used for sewer rates. That is to say, everyone should pay for the service he uses. The policy of the more you use the cheaper the product can no longer be valid in these times of shortages of resources and added pollution in our streams. If the large users cannot afford this method, their alternative is to recycle their water by doing their own complete treatment. This would conserve water, decrease the cost at the treatment plant and would be a more effective way of cleaning up our streams. As the Rate Schedule is now proposed, the little guy bears the load.

The Committee was most disturbed to read in the Notice that Maumee River channel improvements are a part of this plant expansion. Nowhere in the engineering plans and description presented to the public at the Dec. 15, 1973 public hearing was there any mention of channel improvements. What are these channel improvements?

If you have a permit to do this channel improvement, when did Fort Wayne get the permit and why was this not made known to the public?

Where is the environmental impact statement for this channel work?

The Fort Wayne Chapter feels that until the appropriate changes are made for this rate increase, the increase cannot now go into effect as planned for the end of February.

Ethyle R. Bloch

Mrs. Ethyle R. Bloch, Co-Chm.
Clean Water Committee
Fort Wayne Chapter, IWLA
6340 Donna Drive
Fort Wayne, Ind. 46819

The Council then adjourned.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that I am the duly elected, acting and incumbent City Clerk of the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana and as such the custodian of the records of the Common Council of said City and that the above and foregoing is the true, full and complete record of the proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana for its Special Session, held on Monday the 20th day of January, 1975; that the numbered ordinances and resolutions shown therein were duly adopted by said Common Council on said date and were signed and approved or disapproved by said Mayor as and on the dates shown as to each such ordinance and resolution respectively; and that all such records, proceedings, ordinances and resolutions remain on file and record in my office.

WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the City of Fort Wayne, Indiana, this 20th day of January, 1975.


Charles W. Westerman
City Clerk


SEAL